

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No.: 3:99-CR-99-TAV-CCS
	)	
TAURUS JONES,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This criminal case is before the Court on the defendant's motion for a sentence reduction [Doc. 46]. In the defendant's motion, the defendant requests that the Court resentence him pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and in accordance with Amendment 782 and Amendment 788 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines Manual. The government has responded [Doc. 47]. The government defers to the Court's discretion whether and to what extent to grant any such reduction, subject to the limitations of 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and section 1B1.10 of the United States Sentencing Guidelines Manual.

**I. Standard of Review**

"Federal courts are forbidden, as a general matter, to modify a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed, but the rule of finality is subject to a few narrow exceptions." *Freeman v. United States*, 131 S. Ct. 3685, 2690 (2011) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). One exception is identified in 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2):

[I]n the case of a defendant who has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission . . . , the court may reduce the term of imprisonment, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.

The United States Supreme Court has interpreted § 3582(c)(2) as setting forth two requirements for a sentence reduction. First, “the defendant [must] ha[ve] been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission[.]” *United States v. Riley*, 726 F.3d 756, 758 (6th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Second, “such reduction [must be] consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). If the reviewing court determines that the defendant is eligible for a sentence reduction, then “[t]he court may then ‘consider whether the authorized reduction is warranted, either in whole or in part, according to the factors set forth in § 3553(a).’” *United States v. Thompson*, 714 F.3d 946, 949 (6th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Dillon v. United States*, 560 U.S. 817, 826 (2010)).

In determining whether a defendant has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission, the Court must first determine “the amended guideline range that would have been applicable to the defendant had the relevant amendment been in effect at the time of the initial sentencing.” *Dillon*, 560 U.S. at 827 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); *see also* U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b)(1). Other than substituting Amendment 782 for the corresponding provision applicable when the

defendant was originally sentenced, the Court “shall leave all other guideline application decisions unaffected.” *Id.* And the Court “shall not” reduce a defendant’s term of imprisonment to a term “less than the minimum of the amended guideline range,” nor to a term “less than the term of imprisonment the defendant has already served.” *Id.* § 1B1.10(b)(2)(A), (C). Section 1B1.10 provides one exception to the rule that a defendant may not receive a sentence below the amended guideline range—namely, if the defendant originally received a below-guideline sentence “pursuant to a government motion to reflect the defendant’s substantial assistance to authorities.” U.S. Sentencing Guidelines § 1B1.10(b)(2)(B). In such cases, the Court may grant “a reduction comparably less than the amended guideline range.” *Id.*

In addition to these limits, section 1B1.10 states that a court must also consider the § 3553 factors and the danger to the public created by any reduction in a defendant’s sentence. *Id.* at cmt. n.1(B). A court may further consider a defendant’s post-sentencing conduct. *Id.*

## **II. Factual Background**

The defendant pleaded guilty to conspiring to distribute and possess with intent to distribute cocaine and cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 846, 841(a)(1), and 841(b)(1)(B) [Doc. 47]. At the time of sentencing, the defendant was held responsible for 500 grams of cocaine hydrochloride and 500 grams of cocaine base [Presentence Investigation Report (“PSR”) ¶¶ 5, 12]. Given the amount of drugs for which the defendant was held responsible, the defendant’s base offense level was thirty-six [*Id.*].

The defendant received a two-level firearm enhancement and a two-level enhancement for obstructing justice by absconding as a fugitive [*Id.* ¶¶ 13, 16, 18, 19]. The defendant also received a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility pursuant to section 3E1.1(a) and (b), which resulted in a total offense level of thirty-seven [*Id.*]. The defendant was also a career offender, but the base offense level as a career offender was lower than his otherwise-calculated offense level, and thus did not affect his total offense level [*Id.* ¶ 20]. Given the defendant's criminal history category of VI based on his career offender status, the defendant's applicable guideline range was 360 months' to life imprisonment [*Id.* ¶¶ 32, 47].

The defendant was initially sentenced to 360 months' imprisonment, which was at the bottom of his guideline range. After sentencing, the United States sought a sentence reduction pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 35(b) in light of the defendant's substantial assistance [Doc. 30]. On December 16, 2003, the Court granted that motion and sentenced the defendant to 240 months' imprisonment, which is thirty-three percent below the guidelines range [Doc. 39]. According to the government, the defendant is presently scheduled for release on December 20, 2017 [Doc. 47].

### **III. Analysis**

Amendment 782 to the Guidelines, which became effective on November 1, 2014, revised the Guidelines applicable to drug-trafficking offenses by reducing by two levels the offense levels assigned to the drug quantities described in section 2D1.1. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual App. C, amend. 782. Amendment 782 also makes

corresponding changes to section 2D1.11. Amendment 788, which became effective on November 1, 2014, as well, identified Amendment 782 as retroactive. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual App. C, amend. 788.

Section 1B1.10 of the Sentencing Guidelines addresses reductions under § 3582(c)(2):

In determining whether, and to what extent, a reduction in the defendant's term of imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and this policy statement is warranted, the court shall determine the amended guideline range that would have been applicable to the defendant if the amendment(s) to the guidelines listed in subsection (d) had been in effect at the time the defendant was sentenced.

U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b). Amendment 782 is listed in subsection (d). *Id.* § 1B1.10(d).

A defendant's amended guideline range is calculated by using the procedures set forth in section 1B1.1(a). *Id.* § 1B1.10 cmt. n.1(A); *United States v. Joiner*, 727 F.3d 601, 604 (6th Cir. 2013). Accordingly, in calculating a defendant's amended guideline range, the reviewing court ordinarily must first substitute the revised base offense level provided by Amendment 782 and then apply the trumping provisions of sections 5G1.1 and 5G1.2 as appropriate. *See Joiner*, 727 F.3d at 605 (discussing the procedure for calculating a defendant's amended guideline range in light of the revised base offense levels for crack cocaine offenses provided by Amendment 750).

Section 5G1.1 provides, in relevant part, that “[w]here the statutorily required minimum sentence is greater than the maximum of the applicable guideline range, the

statutorily required minimum sentence shall be the guideline sentence.” U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 5G1.1(b). Section 5G1.2 provides, in relevant part, that “the sentence to be imposed on a count for which the statute (1) specifies a term of imprisonment to be imposed; and (2) requires that such term of imprisonment be imposed to run consecutively to any other term of imprisonment, shall be determined by that statute and imposed independently.” *Id.* § 5G1.2(a).

Section 1B1.10(c) alters this analysis for defendants who have received a departure below a mandatory minimum sentence for their substantial assistance to the government. For this class of defendants, “the amended guideline range shall be determined without regard to the operation of § 5G1.1 (Sentencing on a Single Count of Conviction) and § 5G1.2 (Sentencing on Multiple Counts of Conviction).” U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(c). Here, the defendant is among the class of defendants covered by section 1B1.10(c). Therefore, sections 5G1.1 and 5G1.2 do not apply in calculating the defendant’s amended guideline range.

Applying Amendment 782, the defendant’s revised base offense level based on the defendant’s drug quantity would be thirty. The defendant, however, remains a career offender, and his base career offender level remains thirty-seven. Affording the defendant the same adjustments the defendant originally received, the defendant’s new total offense level is thirty-four. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b)(1). A total offense level of thirty-four and a criminal history category of VI results in an amended guideline range of 262 to 327 months’ imprisonment. Thus, the defendant was

sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission.

Next, the Court must determine whether a sentence reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission. *See* U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10. “[T]o satisfy the second requirement, a guidelines amendment must have had the effect of lowering the defendant’s applicable guideline range.” *Riley*, 726 F.3d at 758 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). As discussed, that is the case here. And it would be consistent with the applicable policy statements to sentence the defendant below the “minimum of the amended guideline range” because the defendant previously received a below-guidelines range sentence “pursuant to a government motion to reflect the defendant’s substantial assistance to authorities.” U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b)(2)(A), (B).

The Court will now consider the § 3553(a) factors in determining whether and to what extent the defendant’s sentence may be reduced. As an initial matter, the Court determines that factors similar to the ones that applied at the defendant’s initial sentencing also apply at this time. Even so, in regard to these factors and in the context of the instant motion, the Court has considered the nature and circumstances of the defendant’s offenses—conspiring to distribute and possessing with intent to distribute cocaine and cocaine base—and the defendant’s history and characteristics.

The Court has also considered the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment for

the offense, to afford adequate deterrence, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and to provide the defendant with needed education and training, medical care, or other correctional treatment.<sup>1</sup> Further, the Court has considered the kinds of sentences available and the sentencing range, the need to avoid unwarranted disparities, and the need to provide restitution to any victims. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

Regarding the defendant's post-sentencing conduct and the risk of danger to the community resulting from a sentence reduction, the government states that the defendant has been sanctioned on nine separate occasions, but that it has no other specific information to present in opposition to a sentence reduction [Doc. 47 pp. 4–5]. The Court considers this in ruling on this motion, but it does not appear that a sentence reduction will create an inordinate risk of danger to any person or the community. *See* U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10, cmt. n.1(B).

Accordingly, after considering section 1B1.10 and the relevant § 3553(a) factors, the Court finds a reduction in the defendant's sentence to be appropriate. The Court will reduce the defendant's sentence in accordance with the amended guidelines range and by an amount "comparably less than the amended guideline range." U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b)(2)(B). In making this determination, the Court is particularly influenced by the changes in offense levels affected by Amendment 782. The Court has also taken into consideration the risk the defendant poses to public safety,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court, however, is not intending to, and is not, imposing or lengthening the defendant's sentence to enable the defendant to complete a treatment program or otherwise promote rehabilitation. *See generally* *Tapia v. United States*, 131 S. Ct. 2382 (2011).



the nature and circumstances of the defendant's offense(s), the defendant's personal characteristics, criminal history, and post-sentencing conduct.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

For the reasons stated herein, the defendant's motion [Doc. 46] is **GRANTED** and the defendant's sentence is **REDUCED** to **176 months' imprisonment**. If this sentence is less than the amount of time the defendant has already served, the sentence shall be reduced to a "time served" sentence. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b)(2)(C).

Except as otherwise provided in this order, all provisions of the judgment dated December 16, 2003 [Doc. 39], shall remain in effect. The effective date of this order is **November 2, 2015**. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(e)(1).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Thomas A. Varlan  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE